



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/608,639	06/30/2000	Yongquin Chen	1-18	9272

7590 12/03/2003

Docket Administrator Room 3C 512
Lucent Technologies Inc
600 Mountain Avenue
P.O. Box 636
Murray Hill, NJ 07974-0636

EXAMINER

JACKSON, CORNELIUS H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2828

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/608,639

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Cornelius H. Jackson

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.


- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24-29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10 October 2003 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Acknowledgment is made that applicant's Amendment, filed on 10 October 2003, has been entered. Upon entrance of the Amendment claims 24-29 were added. Claims 1-29 are now pending in the current application.

Election/Restrictions

3. Newly submitted claims 24-29 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reason(s): the process/method for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product and/or laser system (MPEP § 806.05(h)).

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 24-29 withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-9 and 10-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Verdiell et al. (5870417). Verdiell et al. discloses a gain medium **12** comprising an active region **18**, a beam expanding region **18A**, a first surface having a reflective face **14** and a second surface having an antireflective layer **16**; an optical waveguide **20** located adjacent the gain medium **12** and a Bragg grating **22** integral with or coupled to the optical waveguide **20**, wherein the gain medium and the optical waveguide exhibit a coupling efficiency which even without the presence of coupling optics located between the gain medium and the optical waveguide is great enough that during laser operation, substantially all optical resonance that occurs is resonance of the cavity defined between the reflective face and the grating and the laser is configured to provide multimode output of at least two modes within the grating, **see col. 4, lines 23-54**.

Regarding claims 2-7, 9, 11-14, 16, 18, 21 and 23, Verdiell et al. discloses the laser is operated by direct modulation, **see col. 5, lines 1-5**, and in the absence of a temperature-compensating apparatus, **see col. 7, lines 40-50**, the gain medium **12** comprises a cavity less than 1 cm in length, **see col. 4, lines 16-22**, and the length of the system is less than 100 km, **see col. 5, line 65-col. 6, line 18**.

Regarding claims 8 and 15, Verdiell et al. discloses all the stated limitations, **see col. 6, lines 40-45.**

Regarding claims 17 and 19, Verdiell et al. discloses all the stated limitations, **see col. 7, lines 34-46, and col. 16, lines 28-48.**

Regarding claim 20, the method of forming a device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, the rejection used against the device, stands for the method as well.

Regarding claim 22, Verdiell et al. discloses all the stated limitations, **see Fig. 1.**

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verdiell et al. (5870417). Verdiell et al., as applied to claims 1-9 and 11-23 above, teaches all the stated limitations except the gain medium and optical waveguide are coupled in the absence of coupling optics. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to omit the coupling optics, since it has been held that omission of an element and its function in a combination where the remaining elements perform the same function as before involves only routine skill in the art. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10 October 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued, "Verdiell does not disclose a multimode output comprising two or more co-existing modes".

In response, "[A] multimode output comprising two or more co-existing modes", is not a feature claimed. Although, "the laser is configured to provide multimode output of at least two modes within the grating bandwidth", the presence of a process limitation on product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to the product. In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 1965). While features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally (that is, means plus function), claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. In re Schreiber, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference); see also In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 210, 212-13, 169 USPQ 226, 228-29 (CCPA 1971); In re Danly, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device is, not what a device does." Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc., 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original).

Applicant argued, "Verdiell discloses mode hopping, not the simultaneous emission of a few modes"

In response, Verdiell discloses the front or exit facet is antireflection coated so that the unwanted Fabry-Perot modes of the diode chip itself are significantly reduced if not eliminated; therefore, the invention of Verdiell may simultaneously emit of a few modes. Whether the modes are undesired and weak, or desired due to the type coating used and strong. Also again, the simultaneous emission of a few modes is not a feature claimed.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cornelius H. Jackson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5981 [(703) 272-1942 after January 2004]. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 5:00, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Ip can be reached on (703) 308-3098 [(703) 272-1941 after January 2004]. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.



chj



PAUL IP
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800